

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CHRISTINE HENDERSON, et al.,

Case No. 6:22-cv-326-MC

Plaintiffs,

JUDGMENT

v.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE
HEARINGS, et al.,

Defendants.

MCSHANE, Judge:

Plaintiff, who has filed numerous pro se actions in this district, files a similar action styled as a False Claims Act and “qui tam” RICO case Compl. 3. As in her previous cases, Plaintiff failed to pay a filing fee and failed to apply for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court is unable to make out any claim other than Plaintiff’s general dissatisfaction with how certain agencies handle proceedings regarding her brother, Patrick. Plaintiff lays out a lengthy history concerning Patrick’s care in nursing homes. The allegations are similar to those previously raised by Plaintiff; i.e., allegations detailing her fight with state agencies regarding her ability to act as a third-party’s guardian. Despite the Complaint’s length, Plaintiff fails to set forth any allegations supporting specific factual allegations regarding fraud. Instead, the Complaint merely alleges Plaintiff disagreed with actions taken by the agency. In reviewing the Complaint, it is clear that these allegations are simply a rehashing of Plaintiff Henderson’s allegations in numerous previous cases regarding Patrick’s care. There are no specific factual allegations necessary to support a claim of fraud regarding the who, what, when, where, and how

of a scheme to defraud the federal government. Instead, these allegations, like Plaintiff Henderson's other allegations in numerous previous actions, merely outline her disagreements with state agencies over the quality of Patrick's care. For relief, Plaintiff seeks to eliminate the way the agency currently operates "AND GO BACK TO THE WAY THINGS WERE BEFORE THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS WAS FROMED [sic]." Compl. 10.

As Plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee, failed to apply for in forma pauperis, and fails to state a claim, this action is DISMISSED. Additionally, the Court finds this Complaint is duplicative of numerous other pending actions filed by Plaintiff Henderson. Finally, as this Court has previously informed Plaintiff, there is no indication that Plaintiff is an attorney. Therefore, she may not advance claims on behalf of others and may not proceed pro se in an alleged qui tam action. *Simon v. Hartford Life Ins.*, 546 F.3d 661, 664-65 (9th Cir. 2008).

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED this 27th day of September, 2022.

/s/ Michael McShane
Michael McShane
United States District Judge